

### REMARKS

Claims 1-13 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In the latest Office Action, claims 1-13 were rejected. With this amendment, claims 9 and 12 have been withdrawn and claims 1 and 10 are amended. On the basis of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests consideration of this application and allowance of all pending claims.

The Office Action requested that Applicant file a certified copy of the foreign application upon which the priority claim is based. However, through subsequent phone correspondence, Examiner acknowledged previous receipt of the Taiwanese application filed in accordance with 35 U.S.C. 119(b) by Applicant. In addition, Applicant has filed a new declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67 (a) herewith in accordance with Examiner's request.

Claim 10 was rejected as anticipated in view of Unrein (US Patent 6,324,075), claims 11 and 13 were rejected as obvious in view of Unrein, and claims 1-9 and 12 were rejected as obvious in view of a combination of Unrein and Halligan (5,032,689). Applicant respectfully asserts that the claims, as amended, are patentable over these references. Furthermore, there is no suggestion to modify any of the references or combination of references to achieve the patented invention. For these reasons, the claims, as currently presented, are patentable over the cited references.

Independent claims 1 and 10 have been amended to recite that: "the computer components are visible from outside the computer [] through the mesh screen." Support for this amendment can be found in the specification, e.g., "the screen 2 is selected to be porous enough to allow the interior components of the computer to be viewed from outside the computer." (§ 6, Specification). In this way, the claimed window allows for shielding of EMI while allowing the shielded components to be visible, thus solving the problem of prior art systems that used non-transparent shielding. The cited art, alone or in combination, fails to suggest this claimed feature.

Halligan discloses a "conductive filter media panel," (4:64, Halligan) which can be mesh or another filter media. Directed towards the problems of heat and RFI/EMI shielding, Halligan is devoid of any aesthetic motivation and contains no description of what can or

cannot be viewed from outside the various panel assemblies described. Examiner tries to import the missing element into Halligan by alleging that "it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of the time of the invention to replace the porous window of Unrein with the mesh screen of Halligan where the interior can be viewed from outside there through for the benefit for a more aesthetically pleasing chassis window." (§ 14, Office Action) However, Halligan does not claim, disclose, or suggest a mesh screen for which "computer components within the computer are visible from outside the computer through the mesh screen." Indeed, Halligan's mesh screen does not allow internal components to be viewed. Halligan therefore fails to disclose or suggest this claimed element. Thus, it follows that the combination of Halligan and Unrein does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention. In Unrein, an EMI-attenuating cover encloses a first portion of a motherboard but not a second portion. (Abstract, Unrein) In Halligan, there is a mesh screen for shielding against interference and permitting airflow. The combination of the references would merely result in a mesh screen that encloses a first portion of a motherboard but not a second portion. The suggested combination, therefore, would not achieve the claimed invention.

Moreover, neither reference discloses the alleged motivation of modifying Halligan to create a "more aesthetically pleasing chassis window." (§ 14, Office Action) Examiner's general statement of a desirable objective cannot by itself provide the required specific motivation. (See, e.g. *In re Anita Dembiczak*, 175 F.3d 994, 999 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (emphasizing that the evidence of a "suggestion, teaching, or motivation to combine... must be *clear and particular*." (emphasis added))). Given the absence of such a suggestion in the references or in the motivation, the combination can only spring from one place: the Examiner's impermissible reconstruction of the invention having been instructed by the teachings of the present application. *Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.*, 1 USPQ2d 1593, 1597 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (warning against "hindsight" reconstruction of the prior art). For at least the reasons stated above, Claims 1 and 10, and by extension, the claims that depend from them, are allowable over the cited references.

Based on the foregoing, the application is in condition for allowance of all claims, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes for any reason direct contact would help advance the prosecution of this case to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Case 7833 (Amendment A)  
U.S. Serial No. 10/728,104

Respectfully Submitted,  
Chen Shi-Tsung

Date: 1/28/05

By: *C. Chien*

Colleen V. Chien, Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 55,062  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Phone: 415-875-2319  
Fax: (650) 938-5200  
E-Mail: cchien@fenwick.com